

## REMARKS

Applicants maintain their arguments concerning the allowability of the claims previously submitted. However, solely to expedite prosecution, claim 1 has been amended and new claims 10-17 included. Basis for the amendment to claim 1 and for new claims 10 and 11 may be found, for example, at page 6, lines 5 to 19. New claim 12 is directed to a feature previously found in claim 1. Support for new claim 13 may be found, for example, page 3, lines 27-30. Claims 14-17 are apparatus claims that parallel the method claims 10-13.


Claim 1 now requires that when the selected channel coding rate is 1/1, the video payload is not interleaved; and, when the selected channel coding rate is another of said plurality of channel coding rates, the video payload is interleaved. *Rostocker* does not appear to disclose this feature, and it also does not appear to be disclosed or suggested by *Lee* or *Chen*.

As Applicants have previously pointed out, the publication date of *Christian* is later than Applicants' effective filing date. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that *Christian* be withdrawn as an improper reference under 35 USC 103.

It is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over any permissible combination of the cited references, and that claim 8 is similarly patentable. The remaining claims are directly or indirectly dependent on an allowable claim and thus for this reason at least are also allowable.

Accordingly, reconsideration leading to allowance of all claims now pending in the application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Faruk Mehmet Eryurtlu  
Jian Jun Wu  
Ran-Hong Yan

By:   
Martin I. Finston, Attorney  
Registration No. 31,613  
Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: October 31, 2006